

VOLUME 9

NUMBER 9

PRICE 1/-

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for September, 1968

VOTING AND VIOLENCE	<i>H. W. J. Edwards</i>
IN THEIR ALLEY	<i>C. M. Keane, S.J.</i>
RISINGHILL	<i>Maureen Nyhan</i>
THE CHRISTIAN IN COMMUNICATION	<i>Edward Hartnett, S.M.A.</i>
REFORM OR REVOLUTION	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
LETTER TO A MARXIST	<i>E. L. Way</i>

Contents

Page

513 FROM PERMISSIVENESS TO VIOLENCE
Margaret Saville

516 VOTING AND VIOLENCE
H. W. J. Edwards

527 WE BELIEVE

537 THE CHRISTION IN COMMUNICATION
Edward Harnett, S.M.A.

547 LETTER TO A MARXIST
E. L. Way

553 RISINGHILL
Maureen Nyhan

559 REFORM OR REVOLUTION
J. M. Jackson

566 ANY QUESTIONS ?
William Lawson, S.J.

572 BOOK REVIEW
Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by Lithographic Universal Ltd., Bray.

Annual subscription : one year, twenty shillings; in the U.S.A., Canada and Australia, three dollars; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 20/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 9

SEPTEMBER, 1968

NUMBER 9

From Permissiveness to Violence

MARGARET SAVILLE

TRAVELLING on the same train, with headlines glaring "Students Revolt", a woman said to me, "My Mother says we are frightened of our own children; terrifying thought, isn't it?"

"That's been obvious for years", I said, "and as a result look at the Universities. The Vice Chancellors, whatever they may say, have yet to convince me they too aren't weaklings."

Bound as we are to have stresses and strains in families, parents need not — cannot, in fact — be infallible. To apply one's conscientious best, and be true to one's very real parental instincts on all occasions, positively rejecting mere whims, either of one's own or one's children; but much more important, refusing to be side-tracked into follow-my-neighbour leads, merely for the sake of popularity, these are the vital stars to follow. It is when we try to apply Aesop fable methods to our children's training — or lack of it — that the whole thing becomes destructive, and children are confused. In such an atmosphere they fail to develop emotionally, largely through lack of confidence in themselves stemming from a lack of it (be it unconscious) in their parents, who themselves are suffering from an inferiority complex. All this can breed violence in later years.

Children have to *grow* to responsibility, and if you continually confuse them, it takes forever. It is not fair to thrust it upon them too soon, by allowing them to choose everything for themselves. In justice you cannot burden them with decisions beyond their age; anymore than you can conscientiously expect them to cross a main road safely before they have learned curb drill. Even then, though the risks remain, you have at least prepared them for these.

Permissiveness is a misnomer, since it merely leads to confusion and worse restrictions. Referring to the universities Kingsley Amis says, quite rightly, "More means worse", and that too many students are doing book work when they aren't bookish people. In other words they should be at technical colleges — Colleges of Advanced Technology, if you will, but why jumped-up CATS? The snobbishness of the 11-plus has now reached university level to the absurd extent that technical colleges now have to be called 'universities'. It is all so naïve, and fools no one. Why cannot young people be left to do what they are best suited to do, be it plumbing or planning? I suppose we need both, but personally prefer plumbers! This square peg in a round hole technique has been given as one of the reasons for student rioting, but many of the rioters are the children of the permissive "Do as you like, but don't bother me" paternity. What happens when they get in Society's hair?

A minority of students (or any other section of society) determined to force its opinion, by violent means, on a reasonable self-disciplined and stabler majority, equally determined to get reforms but by saner and subtler means, suggests an upbringing of confused permissiveness, with emphasis upon the academic at the expense of emotional growth.

Sooner or later someone has to clamp down the hatches; no community can go on indefinitely tolerating ad lib violence. So what does all the so-called permissiveness amount to in the end, against an authoritarian regime, be it the left or the right, which will always follow where self-discipline has failed to be applied.

Confused kids may be good for old-school Communists,

so that they may eventually pick up the bits, but in the interests of our children is it not time we threw out permissiveness and gave benevolent discipline a try? As Mr. Bell, M.P., suggests, let both parents and university authorities recover from their fright before the next generation grows up to the agonising and dangerous immaturity our present students are now suffering.

Life Lost in Living

The endles cycle of idea and action,
Endless invention, endless experiment,
Brings knowledge of motion but not of stillness;
Knowledge of Speech, but not of silence;
Knowledge of words, and ignorance of the Word.
All our knowledge brings us nearer to our ignorance,
All our ignorance brings us nearer to death,
But nearness to death no nearer to God.
Where is the life we have lost in living?
Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge?
Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?

T. S. Eliot: Choruses From the Rock.

Official status for the Welsh language, an end to the violation of valleys in Wales to further the projects of English cities, direct action, and a synthesis of aristocracy and syndicalism are all discussed in this article together with the noxious element in capitalism, and the pop-gun armies whose engineers are said not to know how to make a Catherine wheel.

Voting and Violence

H. W. J. EDWARDS

I HAVE just been re-reading George Sorel's *Reflections on Violence*, a work which many a native of my country would do well to read if only because certain incidents in Welsh recent history have much to do with Sorel's treatise. It is often said by our politicians of all the parties including Plaid Cymru, that we are a peaceful people; and it is possible to give some evidence that goes to show that. For example, the Welsh unlike their cousins the Cornish, were extraordinarily passive about the Change of Religion. They were equally passive about the Act of Incorporation. And yet Shakespeare and Milton suggest another side. Shakespeare makes Owain Glyndwr a most militant fellow, as indeed he was. And his Gwentian Fluellen talks like a regular sergeant. In 1634 Milton's *Comus* was performed at Ludlow where the Court of the Marches was held. In that masque Wales is described as "an old and haughty nation, proud in arms".

Welsh Record

If the Irish and Scots have furnished the old British Empire with some illustrious soldiers, the Welsh may properly recall Owain Lawgoch, one of the many Welsh who fought for France, the sailor who destroyed the English fleet off La Rochelle in the late 14th century, and General Picton, who, so some of us say, was the real victor at Waterloo. Our

martial character is to be discerned in the militant Chartism of Monmouthshire, the Rebecca Riots of West Wales, the anti-tithe demonstrations under Samuel Roberts of Llanbrynmair, the virtual state of war in and around Merthyr Tydfil in the days of Dic Penderyn, and the Tonypandy Riots, which two last were practical examples of Sorel's description of how to gain workers control through direct action.

It may be worth noticing, by the way, that Sorel's work was translated into English by a Tory of great promise, T. E. Hulme, who, alas, died in the first world war. Hulme's Toryism, which some might think eccentric, was fiercely anti-bourgeois, a relic, as some Conservatives might say, of the old Toryism which made Sir Francis Burdett back the Chartists while remaining one of the last Jacobites and which caused Disraeli to be very critical of Peel's new police. But what has this allegedly extinct Toryism of English type to do with Wales?

Again and again I hear it said from Plaid Cymru platforms that the Welsh Nationalist tradition is derived from some allegedly long-lived Welsh radicalism. Hardly anyone disagrees, though that scholarly veteran nationalist, the late Arthur Wade-Evans, always mocked it. Mr. Saunders Lewis, a former president of Plaid Cymru and for many the prophet of Welsh Nationalism, wrote a few years ago in the *Western Mail* where he was characteristically defending the rigorism of the Welsh Sunday: "I am a Welsh Conservative; I am a Welsh Roman Catholic: therefore I am a Welsh Nationalist." It may not be a coincidence that a distinguished member of the legal profession, Mr. Bowen Rees, wrote about that time a useful pamphlet on the Welsh political tradition in which having attempted to make the "radical" case, he was at some pains to consider Mr. Lewis' conservatism.

Now Mr. Lewis was one of the Three Men jailed before the last world war for an act of arson against the bombing school in Lleyn. He would say that the act was essentially conservative in aim, the aim of conserving Lleyn, and by that token, conserving the totality of Wales. Mr. Lewis has

always emphasised society in the strictest conservative fashion. But it is this emphasis upon society which may well be made against the exactions of a state, especially when that state is an imperium. Here is a link between this conservatism and the syndicalism of Sorel.

Noxious element in Capitalism

It was largely owing to Mr. Saunders Lewis that Plaid Cymru soon after its formation declared that capitalism was Wales' first enemy. This declaration should not, of course, be interpreted in a Socialist or Communist (Marxist) sense. It arose from the Nationalist policy of "*perchentyaeth*", which is somewhat like Distributism save for the greater emphasis upon mutual aid and a traditional and voluntary co-operation of productive units. In his *Canlyn* Arthur S. L. goes so far as to suggest the development of southern Wales away from industrialism, which is for him and those who follow him the most noxious element in capitalism.

Today he is the president of one of the societies which have a reputation for direct action, *Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg*, the Welsh Language Society, which has held demonstrations, sit-downs outside post offices, marches and and noisy protests against several of its members who have been imprisoned for doing what is now legal, — now legal owing no doubt to the society's effective propaganda. It is, however, clear that what is legal is by way of mere grace and favour. And it happens often enough that the law breaks down, e.g. when a man asks for a form which a post office unfortunately lacks but which it is supposed to have.

This society demands much more than grace and favour. It wants "official status". But to get that status, certain acts of parliament must be amended. The Act of Incorporation of 1536 made a bee-line for the Welsh tongue, the "extirpation" of which is necessary for the incorporation. I am not surprised when I hear it said that this society is rather more nationalist than Plaid Cymru. And it is worth noticing that one of those who have gone to prison for the language, Glamorgan born Mr. Neil Jenkins, was expelled from Plaid Cymru for criticising Mr. Gwynfor Evans, the

Blaid's president, when he came down on the side of the United Nations against Katanga. Another young man, this time from the north, Twm Geraint Jones, who was also jailed, regards Plaid Cymru with derision.

I take a risk, but a sound one, in saying that both these young men are in some reasonable sense conservatives. Twm Jones spends much time in helping to restore old cottages in his native Gwynnedd. He belongs to a small Welsh arcanum which compiles amusing examples of liberal clichés like "this day and age". Mr. Jenkins, whom I know very well, is a very good example of the radical-conservative, that is, a radical who is one for conservative ends. I fancy that his admiration for our Calvinists is a sign, for Calvinism is undoubtedly in the Welsh tradition, and what passes for it, a much older and even Catholic thing, is found in Wales before the change.

Direct Action

In the summer of 1960 Plaid Cymru was in the dumps. I was so concerned, though as a Tory this may seem strange, that I travelled about Wales to speak to certain veteran members of the Blaid about the low state into which the Blaid had fallen. Since then all kinds of "ginger" movements have come into existence and since then Nationalists acting on their own have tried to avoid the parliamentary methods.

The challenge came a little earlier — in 1958 when S.L. in a surprise speech at the National Eisteddfod at Ebbw attacked the prevailing slogan of "Bread rather than Beauty" and proposed instead, "Death rather than Dishonour". That autumn a small token attack was made on Llwyn Fyrnwy. When Tryweryn was raped and the reservoir began to take shape, the attacks on the installations mounted and some went to prison on being caught. In 1966 there was a successful attack upon a valuable plant at the Clywedog site of the reservoir then being built just about the same time that the Nelson Column in Dublin was blasted. Many were interviewed. No one was discovered. Since that time there have been other bomb incidents which must, I think, be

divided into two categories. The first were at reservoirs and pipe lines. The second were at buildings in Cardiff's Civic Centre.

Pop-gun Armies

Among the "extremist" groups formed since 1960 I should mention the Free Wales Army and what became fairly soon its political arm, the Patriotic Front. There is a widespread belief that the F.W.A. is responsible for the explosions of the last two years, and the F.W.A. has hinted that its highly decentralised forces are responsible. There are others who believe that the F.W.A. is a piece of sheer theatricality, a pop-gun army (as Connolly's army which caused the 1916 rising was called). Mr. Gwynfor Evans has said (on TV) that the F.W.A. lacks the knowledge to make a Catherine wheel, though that, were it true, would not hinder its men from using a device the works of which they were ignorant. But Mr. Evans is quite wrong since I know at least one Welshman competent enough and sympathetic enough to give technical advice on this matter. Others hold that a group which is intent on secrecy has the expertise and the daring to produce the effects which have enraged all the politicians — which have chiefly enraged Mr. Gwynfor Evans and the official Plaid Cymru men.

Some hold that the F.W.A. or some kindred group is responsible for the explosions that have damaged reservoirs or parts of them and their pipe-lines while others, possibly agents provocateurs (Mr. Gwynfor Evans' theory, this) are responsible for the explosions in Cardiff's civic centre at least. My own guess is that these latter acts were not the work of extreme Nationalists. If I am wrong, then the only reason for the acts that makes any sense is that they have been done in order to do the maximum injury to Plaid Cymru and to Mr. Evans in particular.

Indeed, Mr. Evans wrote recently to me about one of my articles in a Welsh periodical, the tabloid *Herald of Wales*, which has always tried to give an all round picture of Welsh affairs. In that article I asserted that until 1961 Mr. Evans was in favour of some kind of direct action. Mr. Evans

tells me that by making that assertion I have as good as lost thousands of votes in the forthcoming by-election at Llanelli. Notice that he did not deny my assertion. He did no more than accuse me of "irresponsibility". But not so long ago when a young Welshman asked Mr. Evans at a Nationalist meeting in Llanelli a question about the investiture and about Mr. Evans' fence sitting on the subject, Mr. Evans accused him also of helping to lose the election. A well-known Welsh don, Professor J. R. Jones, who is among the ardent members of Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg, went over to talk sympathetically to the young man. Professor Jones is among a quite important element of the Nationalist movement which Mr. Evans would doubtless call "extremist".

Let us see whether Mr. Evans was ever an "extremist". In 1946 in a lecture at Abergavenni, one of Wales' "Popes-towns" and the home of the Benedictine mystic, Father Baker, Mr. Evans uttered these words on the burning of the bombing school. "It was an act of heroism which refreshed the sterility of the thirties. Only the self seekers were afraid and angered." Say, if you please, that it was only a little and an almost symbolical action. It was direct action. It was violent. This may be the moment to point out that violence is not necessarily wrong. Indeed, that holy Welsh woman, Ann Griffiths, the Calvinist hymnwriter, used the word in the good sense when in her letters she wrote that she would not gain God save with effort and violence. Violence here seems to mean an intense importunacy. Some times it means an intrusive ferocity, though the defenders may use a just violence in return. I can easily imagine extremists saying that violence is necessary to stem violation. That through utterly constitutional means several areas of Wales have been taken over by English conurbations for their water supplies, that the Dulais valley in Powys is about to be seized for the same reason and that another ten valleys are earmarked may suggest that violation is more serious than violence on occasion.

Should quantity be the Criterion?

The ideological democrat will perhaps say that a mere

region of $2\frac{1}{2}$ million souls dare not succeed against great cities and their industrial projects. It is true that the senior burgesses for Greater London's territory outnumber the 36 Welsh members. This point of view was, of course, well met by Burke and others who preferred a traditional policy to a democracy where quantity is the criterion. Burke's arguments will, however, be disliked by the "good" Nationalists who use the quantitative arguments again and again.

For example, Mr. Evans told me that, despite the poor showing of Plaid Cymru candidates in the local elections (against the dramatic successes of the Scots) 26 per cent of the votes cast were for Plaid Cymru. This fascination for percentages which goes with straw polls angers many a veteran. But to criticise it brings down wrath from those who accuse a critic of being "undemocratic" as if democracy — of any sort — were validly inferred from the Gospels.

I notice that among the critics is the Rev. F. M. Jones, a veteran Nationalist from Llandebie, which small township is today almost wholly Nationalist thanks to his missioning, who has long criticised what he feels to be liberal apologetics for nationalism. He, the anglican rector of Chwillog near Pwllheli, argues much in the manner of Hans Morgenthau, who has opposed the general liberal concepts of self-determination, and the advance of world peace by the grant of independence to nations of the kind which have popular constituent assemblies. One may note that this liberal view is so widely held that people seem to take it for granted that no region of the world should achieve independence unless guarantees for parliamentary democracy or something like that are first given. Such liberals are not always consistent. They were most eager that Ethiopia should be freed from Italian imperialism and handed back to its own Byzantine-style emperor. They turn their collective Nelson eye to the Nagas. The aggression by China against Tibet they allow because they feel that Chinese Marxists are more progressive than lamas.

Action against Liverpool's Project

Some months ago I asked Mr. Gwynfor Evans whether I

might quote extensively from two memoranda which he claimed were the private property of Plaid Cymru. That one Welsh newspaper has exact copies of these memoranda together with signatories and that at least a hundred people have had copies (I have one of them) does not cause him to change his mind. Indeed, the memoranda were published in a Welsh periodical called Cymru Ein Gwlad in December 1961. Mr. Evans wrote that he would take "a poor view" if these memoranda became generally known through my publication. I do not know what he means. I have, however, been advised that, since they were published by one periodical without any action being taken, I may without fear of some legal action quote from them.

The gist of the memoranda has to do with a visit which Mr. Evans paid to the Merioneth executive committee of Plaid Cymru in 1961, a visit in which he and other officials pleaded for some non-constitutional, direct action to be taken against Liverpool's project at Tryweryn. The Merioneth committee rejected the pleas. But the Pwyllgor Gwaith, the Blaid's ruling body, by a majority rejected the Merioneth committee's plea for constitutional action only. The Pwyllgor Gwaith declared that the result of Mr. Evans' passivity until 1961 was to make him bottom of the electoral poll in Merioneth, and that if any in the Blaid wanted to leave it because of its desire for direct action, they ought to go in order that more courageous men might take their place. It must be noticed that Mr. Evans did not call for "violent" direct action. When he is confronted by the evidence he will say that he called only for some kind of passive resistance similar to that which he employed when a hundred or so Nationalists plugged the roads leading to Trawsfynydd military camp in the autumn of 1951. But this is quibbling. By direct action I mean just that. I do not infer violence, though I suspect that some kind of violence is highly likely.

It has always seemed significant to me that after the explosion at Clywedog and the sit-down demonstrations by Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg, Mr. Evans won the momentous election at Carmarthen while Plaid Cymru knocked down an 18,000 Labour majority in Y Rhondda to just under

3,000. At least, these acts did not lead to any loss of votes unless, indeed, the Blaid would have done even better, which few would dare suppose. And yet the officials of Plaid Cymru blamed the direct actionists for the poor polls at the local elections. They also blame those who hold strong views on the language and the investiture.

Some extremists may agree with him. They are aiming not only at independence but at Mr. Evans and his official type Nationalists, chief of whom is Mr. Millward, who outdoes almost everyone in reviling extremists (as one of Prince Charles' tutors in the near future, his attitude is most understandable).

Some of the extremists may well be in sympathy with the 1320 Club which has recently been excommunicated by the Scots National Party. This club in its study of a Scottish Constitution has produced a system based on the historic Scots estates and arranged both vertically and horizontally in which look like corporations. The 1320 Club holds that there is no place for party politics in Scotland.

I have some sympathy for this point of view. I have long felt that the English party system is rather bogus. I believe that the air of Westminster leads to that kind of moderation which amounts to a surrender of once firmly held principles. Mr. Gwynfor Evans tried to take the oath in Welsh. The Speaker courteously refused to admit this. I believe he ought to have made much more than a token resistance. Of course, there are some extremists who argue that he should have refused the oath. For them the Westminster parliament is not the arena.

The Scots Nationalists have had their moments of direct action — witness the taking of the Stone of Scone from Westminster Abbey, the defacing of pillar boxes in Scotland which proclaimed Elizabeth II, and the constant taking of Union Jacks from public buildings. But they have not lost anything of consequence on that account. Moreover, Mrs. Ewing, the Scots Nationalist M.P. when asked whether she agreed with the project of declaring a Scottish U.D.I. answered, "you can call it what you like, but we shall take it."

And again (in Cardiff in my hearing). "I have not gone to Westminster to settle down but to settle up." One cannot avoid the violent tone in such pronouncements. The Scots Nationalists are by no means so obsessed with strict adherence to English constitutional dictates. In comparison Plaid Cymru leans backwards in its efforts to appear scrupulously constitutional. This may be partly because it is much harder to disincorporate than to break a union. I am informed by a Scottish Tory and a jurist that the Act of Union did not destroy the historic Scots estates which produced the Scottish parliament. It is, from his point of view, feasible to restore the Scottish parliament in a constitutional manner. It may be true that the Act of Incorporation did not destroy the Welsh estates which were the foundation of Glyndwr's Parliament at Machynlleth. But whereas the Scots still value their clans, their baronage, their burghers and their upland lairds and followings, Wales has next to none of that from its ancient past. It still has the Gwerin, which, unfortunately, has been so interpreted by Nationalists of the soi-disant democratic sort as to mean no more than "the people". "Gwerin" does not mean that. It rather means a specific class of small propertied men of pedigree. But perhaps the historic Welsh estates could be reformed in some way. I often find that some apparently proletarian family in a Glamorgan valley has its heritage of bards or that some poor old woman is a Gloran, a status woman still matters in Y Rhondda.

Miners co-operate and Mines Close

The fifteen year plan for coal-mining which I read in 1952 when on my way to Denmark, contained the curious note that it was to be hoped that the Welsh miners would co-operate, — "for the good of the nation". We have seen the gradual disappearance of the mining constituency in southern Wales as the mines close. Those who go simply for "jobs", and they include many Nationalists of the progressive kind, do not understand that a miner, as Sorel idealised, was not just a proletarian, a man doing a job. To the Welsh syndicalists as to Sorel, the miner was a natural

soldier, a potential hero. He had something of the qualities of the landsman. But the statisticians and their like do not understand. They will provide "alternative employment" which for them means no more than another source of weekly income. That only too many of us, including the miners, tend to go along with that view points to the mental corruption which accompanies proletarianisation. In truth capitalism is Wales' first enemy.

It is, I believe, relevant to this aspect that Sorel approvingly quoted Joseph de Maistre's rejection of "man". De Maistre wrote that he had met Poles, Frenchmen, Spaniards et cetera but not "man". I found out some years ago that the Englishman does not think of a Welsh miner simply as a miner who happens to mine in Wales. Correctly enough, the Englishman regards the Welsh miner as a special sort of man who has aptitudes which mark him out. "We are a people who have come down in the World." So wrote Saunders Lewis. The words are true for us all. We in Wales need to conserve and restore the pristine aristocratic virtues however diffused and overlaid by the exigencies of the times. But the recovery of a sense of our being downstarts would conduce to a temper by no means of the social-democratic kind. It might lead to workers control. The late Arthur Henderson is alleged to have said to a well-known Welshman that, while the English miners would not be able to run the mines, such a task was possible for the Welsh miners, judging from their ability to run their chapel and other ad hoc communities.

To the "well-brought up" chap, a synthesis of aristocracy and syndicalism makes no sense. But it would make plenty of sense to many I know in Wales and to many, many more if they can be persuaded from their addiction to English politics.

VOICE OF THE CHURCH

We Believe

VENERABLE BROTHERS AND BELOVED SONS,

With this solemn liturgy We end the celebration of the nineteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and thus close the Year of Faith. We dedicated it to the commemoration of the holy Apostles in order that We might give witness to Our steadfast will to be faithful to the Deposit of faith which they transmitted to Us, and that We might strengthen Our desire to live it in the historical circumstances in which the Church finds herself in her pilgrimage in the midst of the world.

We feel it Our duty to give public thanks to all who responded to Our invitation by bestowing on the Year of Faith a splendid completeness through the deepening of their personal adhesion to the Word of God, through the renewal in various communities of the profession of faith, and through the testimony of a Christian life. To Our Brothers in the Episcopate especially, and to all the faithful of the Holy Catholic Church, We express Our appreciation and We grant Our blessing.

Likewise We deem that We must fulfil the mandate entrusted by Christ to Peter, whose successor We are, the least in merit; namely, to confirm Our brothers in the faith. With the awareness, certainly, of Our human weakness, yet with the strength impressed on Our spirit by such a command, We shall accordingly make a profession of faith, pronounce a creed which, without being strictly speaking a dogmatic definition, repeats in substance, with some developments called for by the spiritual condition of our time, the creed of Nicea, the creed of the immortal Tradition of the Holy Church of God.

In making this profession, We are aware of the disquiet which agitates certain modern quarters with regard to the faith. They do not escape the influence of a world being

profoundly changed, in which so many certainties are being disputed or discussed. We see even Catholics allowing themselves to be seized by a kind of passion for change and novelty. The Church, most assuredly, has always the duty to carry on the effort to study more deeply and to present in a manner ever better adapted to successive generations the unfathomable mysteries of God, rich for all in fruits of salvation. But at the same time the greatest care must be taken, while fulfilling the indispensable duty of research, to do no injury to the teachings of Christian doctrine. For that would be to give rise, as is unfortunately seen in these days, to disturbance and perplexity in many faithful souls.

It is important in this respect to recall that, beyond scientifically verified phenomena, the intellect which God has given us reaches *that which is*, and not merely the subjective expression of the structures and development of consciousness; and, on the other hand, that the task of interpretation—of hermeneutics—is to try to understand and extricate while respecting the word expressed, the sense conveyed by a text, and not to recreate, in some fashion, this sense in accordance with arbitrary hypotheses.

But above all, We place Our unshakable confidence in the Holy Spirit, the soul of the Church, and in theological faith upon which rests the life of the Mystical Body. We know that souls await the word of the Vicar of Christ, and We respond to that expectation with the instructions which We regularly give. But today We are given an opportunity to make a more solemn utterance.

On this day which is chosen to close the Year of Faith, on this Feast of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, We have wished to offer to the Living God the homage of a profession of faith. And as once at Caesarea Philippi the Apostle Peter spoke on behalf of the Twelve to make a true confession beyond human opinions, of Christ as Son of the Living God, so today his humble Successor, Pastor of the Universal Church, raises his voice to give, on behalf of all the People of God, a firm witness to the divine Truth entrusted to the Church to be announced to all nations.

We have wished Our profession of faith to be to a high

degree complete and explicit, in order that it may respond in a fitting way to the need of light felt by so many faithful souls, and by all those in the world, to whatever spiritual family they belong, who are in search of the Truth.

To the glory of God Most Holy and of Our Lord Jesus Christ, trusting in the aid of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, for the profit and edification of the Church, in the name of all the Pastors and all the faithful, We now pronounce this profession of faith, in full spiritual communion with you all, beloved Brothers and Sons.

Profession of Faith

We believe in one only God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Creator of things visible such as this world in which our transient life passes, of things invisible such as the pure spirits which are also called angels, and Creator in each man of his spiritual and immortal soul.

We believe that this only God is absolutely one in His infinite holy essence as also in all His perfections, in His omnipotence, His will and His love. He is *He Who Is*, as He revealed to Moses; and He is *Love*, as the Apostle John teaches us: so that these two names, Being and Love, express ineffably the same divine Reality of Him Who has wished to make Himself known to us, and Who, "dwelling in light inaccessible", is in Himself above every name, above everything and above every created intellect. God alone can give us right and full knowledge of this Reality by revealing Himself as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in Whose Eternal Life we are by grace called to share, here below in the obscurity of faith and after death in eternal light. The mutual bonds which eternally constitute the Three Persons, Who are each one and the same Divine Being, are the blessed inmost life of God Thrice Holy, infinitely beyond all that we can conceive in human measure. We give thanks, however, to the Divine Goodness that very many believers can testify with us before men to the Unity of God, even though they know not the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity.

We believe then in the Father who eternally begets the Son, in the Son, the Word of God, who is eternally begotten, in

the Holy Spirit, the uncreated Person who proceeds from the Father and the Son as their eternal Love. Thus in the Three divine Persons, *coaeternae sibi et coaequales*, the life and beatitude of God perfectly One superabound and are consummated in the supreme excellence and glory proper to uncreated Being, and always "there should be venerated Unity in the Trinity and Trinity in the Unity".

We believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who is the Son of God. He is the Eternal Word, born of the Father before time began, and one in substance with the Father, *homousios tó Patri*, and through Him all things were made. He was incarnate of the Virgin Mary by the power of the Holy Spirit, and was made man: equal therefore to the Father according to His divinity, and inferior to the Father according to His humanity, and Himself one, not by some impossible confusion of His natures, but by the unity of His person.

He dwelt among us, full of grace and truth. He proclaimed and established the Kingdom of God and made us know in Himself the Father. He gave us His new commandment to love one another as He loved us. He taught us the way of the Beatitudes of the Gospel: poverty in spirit, meekness, suffering borne with patience, thirst after justice, mercy, purity of heart, will for peace, persecution suffered for justice sake. Under Pontius Pilate he suffered, the Lamb of God bearing on Himself the sins of the world, and He died for us on the Cross, saving us by His redeeming Blood. He was buried, and, of His own power, rose the third day, raising us by His Resurrection to that sharing in the divine life which is the life of grace. He ascended to heaven, and He will come again, this time in glory, to judge the living and the dead: each according to his merits — those who have responded to the Love and Pity of God going to eternal life, those who have refused them to the end going to the fire that is not extinguished.

And His kingdom will have no end.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, Who is Lord, and Giver of life, Who is adored and glorified together with the Father and the Son. He spoke to us by the Prophets; He was sent by Christ after His Resurrection and His Ascension to the

Father; He illuminates, vivifies, protects and guides the Church; He purifies the Church's members if they do not hun His grace. His action, which penetrates to the inmost of the soul, enables man to respond to the call of Jesus: Be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect (*Mt. 5, 48*).

We believe that Mary is the Mother, who remained ever Virgin, of the Incarnate Word, our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and that by reason of this singular election, she was, in consideration of the merits of her Son, redeemed in a more eminent manner, preserved from all stain of original sin and filled with the gift of grace more than all other creatures.

Joined by a close and indissoluble bond to the Mysteries of the Incarnation and Redemption, the Blessed Virgin, the Immaculate, was at the end of her earthly life raised body and soul to heavenly glory and likened to her risen Son in anticipation of the future lot of all the just; and We believe that the Blessed Mother of God, the New Eve, Mother of the Church, continues in Heaven her maternal rôle with regard to Christ's members, co-operating with the birth and growth of divine life in the souls of the redeemed.

We believe that in Adam all have sinned, which means that the original offence committed by him caused human nature, common to all men, to fall to a state in which it bears the consequences of that offence, and which is not the state in which it was at first in our first parents, established as they were in holiness and justice, and in which man knew neither evil nor death. It is human nature so fallen, stripped of the grace that clothed it, injured in its own natural powers and subjected to the dominion of death, that is transmitted to all men, and it is in this sense that every man is born in sin. We therefore hold, with the Council of Trent, that original sin is transmitted with human nature, "not by imitation, but by propagation" and that it is thus "proper to everyone".

We believe that Our Lord Jesus Christ, by the Sacrifice of the Cross, redeemed us from original sin and all the personal sins committed by each one of us, so that, in accordance with

the word of the Apostle, "where sin abounded, grace did more abound".

We believe in one Baptism instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Baptism should be administered even to little children who have not yet been able to be guilty of any personal sin, in order that, though born deprived of supernatural grace, they may be reborn "of water and the Holy Spirit" to the divine life in Christ Jesus.

We believe in one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church built by Jesus Christ on that rock which is Peter. She is the Mystical Body of Christ; at the same time a visible society instituted with hierarchical organs, and a spiritual community; the Church on earth, the pilgrim People of God here below, and the Church filled with heavenly blessings, the germ and the first fruits of the Kingdom of God, through which the work and the sufferings of Redemption are continued throughout human history, and which looks for its perfect accomplishment beyond time in glory. In the course of time, the Lord Jesus forms His Church by means of the Sacraments emanating from His Plenitude. By these she makes her members participants in the mystery of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, in the grace of the Holy Spirit who gives her life and movement. She is therefore holy, though she has sinners in her bosom, because she herself has no other life but that of grace; it is by living by her life that her members are sanctified; it is by removing themselves from her life that they fall into sins and disorders that prevent the radiation of her sanctity. This is why she suffers and does penance for these offences, of which she has the power to heal her children through the Blood of Christ and the Gift of the Holy Spirit.

Heiress of the divine promises and daughter of Abraham according to the Spirit, through that Israel whose Scriptures she lovingly guards, and whose Patriarchs and Prophets she venerates; founded upon the Apostles and handing on from century to century their ever-living word and their powers as Pastors in the Successor of Peter and the Bishops in communion with him; perpetually assisted by the Holy Spirit, she has the charge of guarding, teaching, explaining and

preaching the Truth which God revealed in a then veiled manner by the Prophets, and fully by the Lord Jesus. We believe all that is contained in the Word of God written or handed down, and that the Church proposes for belief as divinely revealed, whether by a solemn judgment or by the ordinary and universal magisterium. We believe in the infallibility enjoyed by the Successor of Peter when he teaches *ex cathedra* as Pastor and Teacher of all the faithful, and which is assured also to the Episcopal Body when it exercises with him the supreme magisterium.

We believe that the Church founded by Jesus Christ and in which He prayed is indefectibly one in faith, worship and the bond of hierarchical communion. In the bosom of this Church, the rich variety of liturgical rites and the legitimate diversity of theological and spiritual heritage and special disciplines, far from injuring her unity, make it more manifest.

Recognising also the existence, outside the organism of the Church of Christ, of numerous elements of truth and sanctification which belong to her as her own and tend to Catholic unity, and believing in the action of the Holy Spirit who stirs up in the heart of the disciples of Christ love of this unity, we entertain the hope that the Christians who are not yet in the full communion of the one only Church will one day be reunited in one Flock with one only Shepherd.

We believe that the Church is necessary for salvation, because Christ, who is the sole Mediator and Way of salvation, renders Himself present for us in His Body which is the Church. But the divine Design of salvation embraces all men; and those who without fault on their part do not know the Gospel of Christ, and His Church, but seek God sincerely, and under the influence of grace endeavour to do His will as recognised through the promptings of their conscience, they, in a number known only to God, can obtain salvation.

We believe that the Mass, celebrated by the priest representing the person of Christ by virtue of the power received through the Sacrament of Orders, and offered by him in the name of Christ and the members of His Mystical Body, is the Sacrifice of Calvary rendered sacramentally present on

our altars. We believe that as the bread and wine consecrated by the Lord at the Last Supper were changed into His Body and His Blood which were to be offered for us on the Cross, likewise the bread and wine consecrated by the priest are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ enthroned gloriously in Heaven, and We believe that the mysterious presence of the Lord, under what continues to appear to our senses as before, is a true, real and substantial presence.

Christ cannot be thus present in this Sacrament except by the change into His Body of the reality itself of the bread and the change into His Blood of the reality itself of the wine, leaving unchanged only the properties of the bread and wine which our senses perceive. This mysterious change is very appropriately called by the Church *transubstantiation*. Every theological explanation which seeks some understanding of this mystery must, in order to be in accord with Catholic faith, maintain that in the reality itself, independently of our mind, the bread and wine have ceased to exist after the Consecration, so that it is the adorable Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus that from then on are really before us under the sacramental species of bread and wine, as the Lord willed it, in order to give Himself to us as food and to associate us with the unity of His Mystical Body.

The unique and indivisible existence of the Lord glorious in Heaven is not multiplied, but is rendered present by the Sacrament in the many places on earth where Mass is celebrated. And this existence remains present, after the Sacrifice, in the Blessed Sacrament which is, in the tabernacle, the living heart of each of our churches. And it is our very sweet duty to honour and adore in the Blessed Host which our eyes see, the Incarnate Word Whom they cannot see and Who, without leaving Heaven, is made present before us.

We confess that the Kingdom of God begun here below in the Church of Christ is not of this world whose form is passing, and that its proper growth cannot be confounded with the progress of civilisation, of science or of human technology, but that it consists in an ever more profound knowledge of the unfathomable riches of Christ, an ever stronger hope in eternal blessings, an ever more arden

response to the Love of God, and an ever more generous bestowal of grace and holiness among men. But it is this same love which induces the Church to concern itself constantly about the true temporal welfare of men. Without ceasing to recall to her children that they have not here a lasting dwelling, she also urges them to contribute, each according to his vocation and his means, to the welfare of their earthly city, to promote justice, peace and brotherhood among men, to give their aid freely to their brothers, especially to the poorest and most unfortunate. The deep solicitude of the Church, the Spouse of Christ, for the needs of men, for their joys and hopes, their griefs and efforts, is therefore nothing other than her great desire to be present to them, in order to illuminate them with the light of Christ and to gather them all in Him, their only Saviour. This solicitude can never mean that the Church conform herself to the things of this world, or that she lessen the ardour of her expectation of her Lord and of the eternal Kingdom.

We believe in the life eternal. We believe that the souls of all those who die in the grace of Christ, whether they must still be purified in Purgatory, or whether from the moment they leave their bodies Jesus takes them to Paradise as He did for the Good Thief, are the People of God in the eternity beyond death, which will be finally conquered on the day of the Resurrection when these souls will be reunited with their bodies.

We believe that the multitude of those gathered around Jesus and Mary in Paradise forms the Church of Heaven, where in eternal beatitude they see God as He is, and where they also, in different degrees, are associated with the holy Angels in the divine rule exercised by Christ in glory, interceding for us and helping our weakness by their brotherly care.

We believe in the communion of all the faithful of Christ, those who are pilgrims on earth, the dead who are attaining their purification, and the blessed in Heaven, all together forming one Church; and We believe that in this communion the merciful love of God and of His Saints is ever listening to our prayers as Jesus told us: Ask and you will receive.

Thus it is with faith and in hope that We look forward to the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.

Blessed be God Thrice Holy. Amen.

PAULUS PP. VI.

Proclaimed by the Pope at the closing of the Year of Faith from the Vatican Basilica, 30th June, 1968.

Help from the Parish

Claver House seeks to assist the developing countries of English-speaking Africa in what is, perhaps, one of the most effective ways possible. Nine-month courses in leadership training are provided for young African laymen to enable them to play an effective part in the public life of their countries. It is difficult to see how aid given so generously from abroad can be put to the best use unless there are dedicated men on the spot who know how to do so. Claver House seeks to train such men.

The all-in cost of training a young African layman for nine months at Claver House is £590. If parish priests and their people would like to consider bearing this cost in the case of one student — thereby adopting him, so to say — the Director would be more grateful than he could easily say. If you are interested write please to the Rev. Paul Crane, S.J. Claver House, 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1.

Before you can communicate a message to a modern mass audience there are a few essential requirements. You must know how to use a microphone and confront a TV camera; you must know the secular meanings of words, or it is likely that you will raise a titter rather than create reverence; there must be in short a whole new theology of communication. Priests were not taught this theology formerly but now it is vital that they should be.

The Christian in Communication

EDWARD HARTNETT, S.M.A.

THE problem of communication of minds is as old as humanity itself. It is the *raison d'être* of the apostolate: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus Our Lord". Today the problem is accentuated by the diversity of races, religions and cultures. Even granting a basic social unit, a dichotomy can develop between the young and adults, husband and wife, superior and subjects, leading to a sudden breakdown in communication. But this breakdown is only a symptom of man's failure to communicate with his God. This is not a modern sin. Ever since the 'Sin of the World', man was not at ease talking to God, much less 'at home' telling others about God.

God dealt with this breakdown by means of the Incarnation. This was God's means of rebuilding the bridge of communication and redeeming us from a silent and frustrating monologue. How did He accomplish this? By breaking into our world and identifying Himself with those with whom He wished to communicate. He joined the travelling people, He spoke their language, shared their problems and lived their life. This was God's way of communicating with man again; it is also our way of helping man to communicate with God.

Communication has a privileged place in Christian theology. You don't have to be a 'peritus' to recognise the constant stress on communication in both the Old and New Testaments. Christ is the Logos — the Word of God. The apostles were given the command 'teach all nations'. Promises, Prophecy, Message, Mission, Good News and Fellowship — all refer to communication. The people of both Testaments were very conscious of their role in transmitting the Message of God in the words of men. Isaiah bound up the testimony — Covenant Message — in the heart of his disciples, lest it be lost for future Israelites (Is. 8 : 16). Christ himself said 'teach all nations teach them to observe all the commands I gave you' (Mt. 28 : 19). Again He says 'What you have heard in the ear preach ye on the housetops' (Mt. 10 : 27). St. Paul — the master architect of spreading the Christian Message — often writes of this burden or necessity placed on him to scatter or broadcast the Good News : "For necessity is laid upon me. Woe to me if I do not preach the Gospel" (1 Cor. 9 : 16). We can never lose sight of a man in a hurry or the 'telegram boy' in all Paul's epistles. Paul and his predecessors used every possible means at their disposal to communicate the Good News. For them it really was something to be excited about; it really was Good News.

A Theology of Communication

Today Christians the world over, and a fortiori Christian preachers, are the inheritors of this Message and Mission. The Message has basically remained the same, but the Mission has widened its horizon, made its task more complex and at the same time imperative. The lack of a pastoral theology of communication adds confusion to this task. Let us be clear from the beginning, by a theology of communication I mean this : An understanding of communication in all its ramifications in relation to our vocation as Christians.

You see we have great difficulty in communicating at all. We rarely comprehend the whole situation sufficiently well to transmit it correctly to others. Religious truth is the very same. God became man — a tremendous truth. The Church

understands this truth in the context of her own time; the Church is no wiser than her age. It never grasps the full implication of this truth and the result is often a stripping of the whole truth in transmission. As I see it there are three aspects in every communication : the source or sender of the message; the message; and the receiver of the message. The primary concern of all communication is : what does the sender of the message want the receiver to understand by the message ?

The person who wants to communicate must first know and understand the message he wants to impart to others. The reason why so many people find it difficult to communicate is that they don't think clearly, and thus are not clear first in their own minds what they want to communicate to others. Many more are not convinced that what they have to communicate is of interest or importance to their audience. They merely proclaim their message without really being concerned whether it is understood or not. They would be very happy if their audience understood the message; but they are not prepared to go to the trouble of dove-tailing their message, to fit the education and experience of their audience.

Lack of Concern for the Secular Meaning of Words

Language is also an important factor in successful communication. Sometimes the language we Christians use is an obstacle to communication in the modern world. Christian preachers are an example of this when they use the word 'grace' in their homily, to denote the life and friendship of God as possessed by Christians. The word 'grace' will have a different connotation for many in the congregation. The younger set may think of 'grace before meals'; for the teenager it may denote the grace with which a girl walks; and for many others it may suggest the name of some person, Grace Kelly perhaps ! Our seeming lack of concern for the secular meaning of words and images used to convey the meaning of the Christian life, is very often the cause of our failure in communication. Moreover it is not uncommon to find Christians using words and clichés that are an excuse for thought, and stand in the way of communication, e.g.,

mystical body, redemption, sacramental character, institution etc. Christian preachers must realise now before it is too late that very often merely to say a thing is to fail to communicate it. One should always elucidate, describe and evaluate so that your audience — through their own experience — understand your message and then you are in communication.

To communicate an idea or opinion you must always convey the message in such a manner, that it is understood by your audience in their own milieu and in terms of their own experience — regardless of whether the medium is picture, word, or sign. When communication is concerned with a true message or a truth, then one is in perfect communication. Because the truth has a certain inner appeal and openness to enable people to accept it. Christ himself said "I am the truth" and "the truth will set you free". When you grasp a truth then you must make a choice to accept or reject it. Preachers of the Word of God have the greatest technique of salesmanship and they haven't used it. We have often proclaimed the Good News, when in fact we should have been communicating it. Today, however, there is a new horizon in the Church and she is becoming more and more conscious of Her role as the communicator in the dialogue between man and God.

Knowing your Audience

What we are trying to do as communicators or preachers of a message, is to establish a 'commonness' with someone. We are trying to share something, and that something is a belief. Along with his message, the communicator must know his audience. There is a greater possibility of success if a message takes account of the patterns of understanding, the attitudes, prejudices, values and goals that the receiver has. The best outlook is to begin with this pattern and try to reshape it. This is known as 'canalizing'. It means the sender provides a channel for motives already existing in the receiver. 'You don't have to sell people the idea of belief in a Supreme being, they are already converted to such a belief; but you have to channel their belief in a Supreme

being to the Catholic conception of God.' These following words were written by a seminarian and should be the vade mecum of every communicator :

"If we should win others to think with us, we must first place ourselves with them, and show them that we understand their position and hold all the truth there is in it. Then we will be able to show them the way to our position. If we commence by thinking with them, they will end by thinking with us wherever the truth is on our side".¹

Many steps have been taken in recent years to throw a pontoon bridge between those who know the Good News, and those eager to hear it. A whole new religious world is opening up to the young by means of catechetics. Teachers are now being taught how to present religion to the young, and catechetical manuals are available to help both teachers and children in this dialogue. Seminarians are witnessing a similar 'pentecost' in preaching techniques; here again the catechetical revival has helped considerably. But the question I ask myself is will these measures be sufficient, will they furnish us with the potential to carry out Christ's command "teach all nations"? Will we in fact be able to say "the poor have the Gospel preached to them"? Is there any significant news, good or bad, that does not reach the whole world in a matter of days? Within an hour of President Kennedy's death in Dallas, practically all the known world not only heard of the tragic news, but had in some sense become involved. Television and radio have the power not merely to inform but to involve all of us in the lives of others and indeed in world events. And Christianity is a world event with personal dimensions.

A Unique Power

These media offer the Church an unique power to communicate the Good News, and open out the world to God's saving Word and Action. If Christ's promises are to be fulfilled we must avail ourselves of the modern means of

1. *Biography of Thomas Edward Shields*. By J. Bayare Ward.

communication. Perhaps the methods we have used up to now have not kept pace with the mission of the Church. The old ways have met with limited success, but new and more far reaching means must also be employed now.

The problem was easily solved on the first Pentecost morning, with the gift of tongues and the polygot mass of pilgrims gathered from the known world. The modern preacher and missionary is not equipped with the gift of tongues; yet he does have the next best gift in what is often referred to as the 'modern miracle', the various means of communication in our time—television, radio, tape recorder, communications satellite etc. It is imperative that we study the whole gamut of these latest and most efficient means of communication for bringing the Word of God clearly before the minds of men and effectively into their lives. Pope Pius XII gave us a backdrop of a pastoral theology of communication in his encyclical letter *Miranda Prorsus*. Among other issues he states: 'How the times are changed from those far off days, when the Apostles trudged slowly along rough paths, bearing to men the true faith. In these our days the Divine Message can be brought in one and the same instant of time to hundreds of thousands of men and more. Christians must clearly take advantage of this boon of modern times, and turn to account the wealth of opportunity afforded them for receiving instruction and the Divine Word itself.'

Pope Pius XII set us an example himself in using the radio and television to further the Good News. He was the first Pope ever to use television. The occasion he choose was a memorable one — the opening of the Eurovision Service in Rome. He began: "On the first Easter Day the Apostles were in the Upper Room hiding for fear of the Jews". But he said "Our Lord came to them through closed doors and He spoke to them, and His first words were words of Peace". The Pope then went on to say "Many doors are closed against Our Lord today, and many doors are closed on Me who Am His Vicar on earth. But today I come to you through closed doors and like my master, my first words will be words of Peace". He had seen the point,

he had grasped the importance of the issue — there are no longer closed doors. We are now in a position to say what is in our hearts to the whole world, but are we equal to the challenge? This is what a theology of communication means: to use these social instruments of mass communication with professional skill, in order to bring about a hallowing of God's name, a doing of His will and the spreading of His Kingdom. The Pope urged that those who use the social instruments of communication and those who receive them, should permeate them with a Christian spirit; transforming them from within with Christian moral principles. Any indiscriminate and continuous viewing or listening is to be deplored. The blue-print for the receiver of these media is discrimination and choice of programmes. To attain this goal the Pope urged that special societies should be formed, e.g., the Look-Listen movement in England.

The Second Vatican Council saw the need to emphasise the importance of the social instruments of communication and issued a decree on the Mass Media. The decree to a large extent affirms the principles and suggestions put forward in *Miranda Proorsus*. "All the children of the Church should join, without delay and with the greatest effort in a common work to make effective use of the media of social communication in various Apostolic endeavours, as circumstances and conditions demand".¹ It is clear that the Church in asking all of us to Christianise the use of these media—is asking some to use the media to communicate news, the Good News. A Pontifical Commission is 'sitting' in Rome at the present, whose purpose is to issue a pastoral instruction on the use of these instruments of social communication. It certainly is needed.

The Microphone is not an Enemy

Priests today in Ireland and developing countries find themselves in a difficult position as regards these media. Most of them did not grow up with television, yet they now have to face TV-conscious congregations on a Sunday morning. They have to instruct their Parishioners how best to

1. Decree on Social Instruments of Communication. Ch. 2, Par. 13.

benefit from the use of these modern media; to educate them to an intelligent choice and appraisal of programmes. To do this the Priest 'must have a thorough knowledge of all the problems to which the cinema, sound radio and television give rise in the minds of Christians,¹ The immediate confrontation for many Priests occurs the moment they ascend the altar steps to face a 'new enemy' in the microphone. Their re-actions vary from the Priest who hugs and eats it—pop singer fashion; to the one who leans his back on the altar and hopes the vacuum in between will drown his words; or again the Priest who puts it all aside and 'blows' away as our Fathers have done. The possibilities of excitement are multiplied with the presence of a microphone in the sanctuary. Many Parishioners are weekly witnesses to 'amplified dribbles' and per chance a tug-of-war, when the Priest forgets to unfasten his chest microphone. But the microphone can become a great friend of the priest; and so like good friends, especially in this case, they must be on speaking terms. The priests today are convinced of the necessity of the modern instruments of communication. They were never trained to talk through a microphone, let us hope their successors are ?

The Church with its life and personalities is holding the headlines in modern times. Church matters are of general interest especially since the Second Vatican Council. Many priests and religious are asked to speak on the radio or appear on television, and put forward the Catholic viewpoint on modern affairs, religious and secular. Some come through the 'witness' with distinction, many flounder in their message and personality. Often they do not know how to sit on a chair and face a television camera, Teleprompting, Jumbo cards, production and presentation — the attitude here is 'let there not be as much as a mention of these things among you'. For religious broadcasters every night is a first night, with professionals before and after them. Yet why should Church representatives be less professional just because they have a certain point of view to present ?

1. Encyclical letter *Miranda Prorsus* P.P. XII Conclusion Par. 118.

All this shows the great need of a pastoral theology of communication. There is however, some encouragement for the future. Until recently those who engaged in 'fringe activities' in the seminary — forms of the lay apostolate — were seen as lacking the ability to digest their theology. Now this atmosphere is changing rapidly, and 'fringe activities' are now being incorporated into the curriculum. The need for priests to be good communicators is widely seen today.

So much is demanded of the People of God in the modern world. A whole new society has grown up around them, and they are called to Christianise it. The former major apostolate of the pen is now overshadowed by the apostolate of the 'Word' and 'picture'. It is comparatively easy to write about Christ and His Saving mystery. But to talk about Christ, to communicate Christ to others one must KNOW the God-man Jesus Christ — knowledge in the biblical sense of intimate personal involvement with the Christ of history and the Lord of heaven. This is what a theology of communication must do : help us to understand and use the social instruments of communication with the technical and professional skill to communicate the Spirit and dynamism of the Christian life and living.

Role for capable Laymen

Here is a sphere in which the Christian layman and woman can play an indispensable role, one the priest cannot play. These men and women can give witness to Christ in their life. Capable lay people should be encouraged and trained to use the social media to communicate the Christian viewpoint on such topics as: birth control, prayer, the unmarried mother, charity, abortion, justice etc. Without this 'life of Christ' in ordinary laymen and women, the priest's preaching and guidance will not find a place in the hearts of his people.

We must always be clear in our minds what communicating the Good News means, whether it is a religious programme, article, talk or homily. The purpose of all religious communication is: to share one's religious experience truthfully and carefully with another, without manipulating either the message or your audience. This applies particularly to

religious programmes on radio or television. You don't tell your audience how they must live their lives, you work it out with them. Radio and television are not 'spectator media'; because of the intimate and personal character of these media, your audience take an active participation in a religious programme. Therefore in a religious programme there must be dialogue — a working out together of a Christian solution to the common needs of men. The function then of every religious communication is to duplicate the incident on the road to Emmaus. Christ never told the disciples who He was, He worked it out with them.

The present era has seen the breaking down of barriers between nations, races and religions. We can no longer hide from one another in this age of communication. 'Men must be brought into closer Communion with one another. They must become Socially minded.'¹ I think we are moving closer to this Global Awareness that the visionary Teilhard de Chardin spoke of. These modern means of social communication are bringing home to us in increasing clarity, an awareness of our solidarity and a sense of community. The world is shrinking to the size of a village, and taking on the features of village life.

These media can fulfil the prophecy on the wall of the BBC in Portland Place: NATION SHALL SPEAK PEACE UNTO NATION. A Christian Peace and soon I pray.

1. Encyclical Letter *Miranda Prorsus*, Par. 34.

A Marxist has written asking into which political field the thinking of E. L. Way leads him. The reply in an open letter is given below . . . It would appear that so far as the quality of living of the people is concerned communism is not revolutionary enough.

Letter to a Marxist

E. L. WAY.

WRITING a monthly article year after year without response or reaction from one's readers sometimes causes misgivings. Is it so much good beer down the sink? (If one did not think it was good, the brewery would close down for strictly disciplined egoism is essential to the journalist.) An *occasional* letter from a reader whether in praise or blame therefore certainly does help. And a Mr. Craig Brown, a Marxist, has written of me in the following terms. "Dear Editor, As a Marxist furnished with *Christian Order* by a Catholic friend permit me to express appreciation of the writings of E. L. Way. Apart from a lucid style and punch lines of impact his informative statistics must be of great value to the politically conscious in search of truth prior to ideology. His detestations of Capitalism, Fascism, and Socialism alike are of no surprise. However, assuming his theological philosophy would make Marxist Humanism unacceptable to him I am wondering into which political field his thoughts lead him. The field is so narrow in view of the espousal of either Christianity or (Marxist) Humanism.

"Allow me to speculate. Both Democratic Socialism and modern Liberalism appear to have no desire to collar the bankers and their iniquitous system of usury which neither genuine Christian nor (Marxist) Humanist could accept. Therefore the only system left to ponder is profit-sharing Capitalism which only provokes the devil in us . . . Well Mr. Way, I am interested in an answer — in depth."

Radical Infirmary

Let us deal with the devil in us first, Mr. Brown. I think that Edmund Burke, in an accurate and elegant phrase, proposed a formula which would be acceptable to Christian and Marxist alike. "There is," he wrote to M. Dupont in October 1789, "by the essential fundamental constitution of things, a radical infirmity in all human contrivance; and the weakness is often so attached to the very perfection of our political mechanism, that some defect in it, — something that stops short of its principle, — something that controls, that mitigates, that moderates it, — becomes a necessary corrective to the evils that the theoretic perfection would produce. I am pretty sure it often is so; and this truth may be exemplified abundantly." A "radical infirmity in all human contrivances", Burke would suggest, is a fact of nature. A fact as stark and terrifying as a proposed assault on the North Face of the Eiger. A very few men have climbed this wall of ice. Thirty-three have died attempting it. To propose dragging a whole community up this perpendicular hell is no more ridiculous than to propose a national march¹ to utopia. We know the road is paved with corpse. If the intelligent Marxist, Fascist, or Nazi does not fear this particular stretch of road building the labourers he wishes to employ do fear it. And they will tell him, and have been telling him for a long time now, to go to hell. So Mr. Brown no more asking for communal assaults on the Eiger. It is not on.

What this Means

This fact does not imply canonizing the status quo. I have said that in the greatest capitalistic country in the world, America, ten millions are starving, crops are destroyed, corn lands lie uncultivated, and farmers are paid billions not to grow food. Economic explanations of these facts cut no ice with me. I could not tell a hungry little negro boy eating laundry starch the economic facts of life. The words would stick in my throat. As they ought to stick in the throat of any ordinary decent human being. The expert somehow, with sincere good will, evades the stark facts. His thesis

or article is not usually written with the hungry little boy perched in his imagination at the end of his table. He is a slave to his expertise, and is dominated by 'facts' which usually within a decade, or a generation, are proved to be fiction. This has happened over and over again. Every single reform has been bitterly opposed by some expert or another. A most casual glance at the history of reform, say E. S. Turner's *Roads To Ruin*, bears this out. How can one account for this? Briefly the expert, the professional, the master of any human knowledge, is usually an expert in what he learned years ago. He is out of touch with the latest information. He has to earn his living and is much too busy to keep up with the latest developments in his science, or field of learning. And this is true of doctors, dentists, economists, lawyers, teachers, priests, and scientists. And in the future, progress in the applied sciences moving at a speed which is startling, it will be necessary for those in this field to be retrained three or four times during the course of their working careers. This being so the layman is not put off by being told by the expert that he has got his facts all wrong. He sees a worker without a house, miserably educated and equipped for our 'competitive' society, with a totally inadequate wage to meet his bills on the one hand, and on the other too many people with far too much in the fields of housing, education, and money and he says that this state of affairs has got to be altered or there will be trouble.

How to Alter the System

But when we come to ways and means of altering the system we find very little agreement. For the committed Christian Marxism is a non-starter not only because of its atheism but also because of the experience of the communist states. Christians therefore search for the existing political party which they think will accomplish the ends which are desirable. Naturally being influenced by their education and experience they gravitate to the party which their class usually supports. Though, of course, there are very many exceptions to this general rule. You will find Christians

sympathetic to a doctors' strike, or a strike by the pilots of an air line who get very hot under the collar when the railwaymen decide to work to rule. It is all very sad, and funny, and very human. We all have a blindspot which unchecked tends to erect our own interests into a general principle. The little starving boy, perched on the end of our table in imagination, seems to disappear very rapidly when his immediate relief means £5 out of our pockets now. We immediately begin to think of 'the general good'. As if that notion included many little boys in duffle coats with an occasional egg on Sundays as a special treat, which has been found to be the case in our great country in this year of progress, 1968.

A little History

But progress has taken place. In the good old days, around 1907, a man with a wife and two children earning £5,000 a year was left after tax with £4,750. Today he would be left with £2,745. The meal for school children used to be a miserable scramble for suet and soup and though you will know from your own children that the school meals are not all that wonderful today, they are much better than they used to be. Our children can be fastidious now. And the vast horde of 'stunted, overworked, underfed' boys and girls have fortunately vanished for ever. Just consider this pen picture: "forty little girls, half of them still at school, were found licking adhesive labels at the rate of thirty gross a day, whose tongues had the polished tip characteristic of label lickers, and the rest of the tongue coated with brown gum. . . ." There were little girls who carried heavy slabs of clay and boxes of scrap; there were others in the Nottingham lace trade whose eyesight was ruined by the double work of school and job. And what about the widows working for 14 hours a day for miserable wages and basement lodgings? (Their lot is far from good even now, and I have said so many times, but it is a little better than it was.) The average wage around 1912, as far as it can be estimated, was about 30s. Allowing for the depreciation of money, there has been notwithstanding a great increase in wages.

No Complacency

That progress has taken place is undeniable. But there is no room for complacency. Our standards just because they have so greatly improved are under constant threat. There are a great many tax payers yearning for the good old days: and a few landowners down to their last 250,000 acres! The position in America is much worse. The rich man's propaganda, through his newspapers, is so intense that an unemployed man there can still say with all sincerity: "Welfare is for bums", and then go on to disclose to the CBS film interviewer that his child had two spoons of gravy for breakfast that morning. And apart from inadequate wages, bad housing, poor education in over-crowded classrooms in decayed, gloomy, half-ruined buildings in England today, there is the sheer misery of the life at work. As a Marxist, Mr. Brown, you ought to know that any change in the relationship between the classes must remain a sad illusion so long as there is no transformation in the technical processes. Herding hundreds of men into industrial prisons, all over the west as well as in Russia, where they exhaust themselves at boring repetitive tasks leads to the permanent look of desperate frustration which can be seen on the faces of factory workers all over the world. The mad headlong rush for the gates as soon as the siren releases them from their daily prison grind is evidence enough for anyone who is not blind or totally without feeling. With the gradual increase of automation much of this horrifying work may come to an end, but it will be totally useless if it results in millions of unemployed. (An estimated number of the hardcore unemployed in America is given as 2 million. Exact figures are not available.) What is so important is raising in technical terms the problems concerning the effect of machines upon the physical and moral well-being of the workers. And of this one does not see much evidence in Russia or the west. A week on a pneumatic drill on the third storey of a building that is being demolished would educate the vast majority of technicians as nothing else seems to be able to do. Under what political regime does one see this essential form of education? Until we wear on our flesh the industrial scars

of our monstrous forms of production, we seem to be quite complacent about extra productivity — for others, in Russia as well as here.

Balance of Evils

I have then a choice of evils before me, Mr. Brown. I cannot vote for any party which requires complete power in order to accomplish the ends of social justice. Experience shows that a party with such power abuses it flagrantly. Nor can we get rid of the brutes, once they have the bit between their communal teeth. Yet if they have not complete power many of the ills we complain of continue to flourish in spite of the wishes of the vast majority. What is left but a form of compromise? So I worked for the success of the Labour Party at the last election. Along with thousands of others I canvassed, and got one very rude reply from a Marxist, I threw my house open to about thirty people on the day of election, I acted for a year as a ward secretary, very unlike Harold Steptoe's sketch, I hope, I stencilled, I duplicated, I got sore sitting attending meetings. The Labour Party was elected. And where are we now, you ask? I am not quite sure. And no one else is either. If we threaten to devalue sterling whenever we get into difficulties that ought to keep the bankers giving us the necessary loans. Our exports will increase. Our standards of living will probably begin to improve about 18 months before the next election. So long as we try to keep up the role of sterling, so long as we play at being a world power we will probably have to put the appropriate pressure on the Bankers for further loans. Under one disguise or another this has been the pattern since 1945. And will continue for some time yet. As for the quality of life, look around Mr. Brown, there are a few signs of hope. A few.

MONTHLY REPORT

This story of an out-of-the-ordinary comprehensive school, now dead through the action of authority, is controversial. In this article, Maureen Nyhan examines the case for Risinghill as presented in a recent book. She finds a good deal to criticise in its pages.

Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School*

MAUREEN NYHAN

THERE was bound to be a book about Risinghill. Michael Duane's philosophy of teaching is highly controversial, inspiring some and repelling others, but it is one to which no educationist can be indifferent. My chief regret is that Duane himself is not the author. From him we might have had a serious and constructive contribution to educational theory. Unfortunately, (and to me, incredibly) this task has been undertaken by Lelia Berg, who admits frankly that she is not a teacher, has no training in psychology or sociology, but is, in her own words, "merely a writer, a parent, and a fully paid up member of a well-known democracy". Admirable as these three qualities are, one questions their relevancy to this self-imposed task of producing a criticism, not only of this country's educational system, but of the principles, aims and techniques of education itself.

Let it be said at once that it is extremely well-written. Some of the descriptive passages dealing with the Islington streets and their inhabitants and the Risinghill site itself are wonderfully evocative. The most valuable part of the book lies in its portrayal of the living conditions of so many of the Risinghill families. Many readers will be shocked to

* Title of a Pelican Original published earlier this year at 6s. and written by Lelia Berg.

learn that such slums still exist in our capital, and if it stirs the conscience of those who have the power to end such squalor the book will have performed a vital humanitarian service.

Note of Hysteria

But not even this very real craftsmanship can atone for the note of hysteria that runs throughout this account of the Risinghill affair. It opens with descriptions of unnamed primary schools run by unnamed teachers who contrive to make Wackford Squeers look uncommonly like the Archangel Gabriel. One is left wondering what the Islington parents were doing, (to say nothing of the N.S.P.C.C., the local police and the probation officers) to allow this alleged brutality to continue. Were the children too frightened to talk? Apparently they were, until Mrs. Berg invited them to record their experiences, at which point they provided luridly detailed descriptions of all manner of physical punishments inflicted on them at the school. One asks again, if Mrs. Berg was satisfied that these stories were true, why did she not instigate a public inquiry? Her taped evidence, if proved, would have secured the instant dismissal of 50 per cent of the teachers in that area. The answer comes in her own words: "I am aware that children, particularly emotionally-deprived children, do not always speak the *factual* truth." (The italics are her own, but no-one will deny that anyone who puts a tape recorder in front of a group of normal healthy children and says, "Tell me all about your cruel teachers", deserves all the answers he gets.)

It becomes increasingly clear, by the end of the first chapter, that these Risinghill "delinquents" were not extraordinary children who behaved in an extraordinary way. Truancy, bullying, stealing and vandalism occur in all schools; it is a matter of degree only. With their background of poor, over-crowded and therefore disorderly homes, these youngsters were particularly hostile and destructive. Thrown as they were into a strange new building which they were to share with the children and staffs of no less than three other dispossessed schools (traditionally rival establishments),

it was inevitable that they should run wild. Michael Duane had his own distinctive answer to that problem, and the purpose of the book, clearly, is to support that answer and to condemn those who saw it as, if not wholly undesirable in theory, simply impracticable.

It is often difficult to be certain whether the author is offering us Duane's own considered educational theory, or her own anarchistic ideology as applied to Risinghill, but the political commentary which forms the counter-plot does provide a certain light relief. Villainous Tory councillors, double-dealing Labour committees, and scheming Communists on the Risinghill staff all contribute to the plot to destroy Michael Duane. Only the anarchist remains incorruptible. We are to believe that the entire Inspectorate and the non-Communist "authoritarians" at Risinghill were also implicated in this campaign to discredit Duane personally and professionally in order to gain a pretext for closing the school. Much of this is tedious in the extreme, and totally irrelevant to what appears to be the *raison d'être* of the book, the vindication of Duane's educational methods.

Meaning of Authority

The Inspectors' Report on Risinghill in 1962 makes the following observations: "an atmosphere of indiscipline which is difficult to describe the loss of productive hours of work because the children are so uninterested, and to put it simply, so unruly, is enormous — the children do not hold authority in any awe — though the Headmaster inspires some liking, he fails largely to inculcate respect. Indeed, he may well regard respect as basically unnecessary in human relations. . ."

It is on this central point of the meaning of Authority that the argument must be based, for Duane's rejection of "authoritarian" methods was deliberate. He did not expect or desire from a child what this Report calls "respect", that is, courtesy and obedience to a just authority. He believed that the Risinghill children were unloved, (which would seem to be a gross libel upon the majority of their parents) and that in their primary schools they had been taught only fear. It was therefore essential, he argued, that he should demon-

strate that he loved them, and that they need not fear him. Compulsion of any kind was anathema to him, because he saw it as a negation of love. Few will accept this in theory, still less in practice. Is it truly loving in a parent or a teacher to fail to give a child the vital strength of self-discipline without which he cannot attain personal happiness, still less give happiness to others?

"I found," says Duane, "that attendance at my lessons improved", and seems to imply that voluntary attendance at the headmaster's lessons is the mark of a happy child. At thirteen a boy may well be content to be left alone to work when the inclination takes him, but three years later when he is required to be punctual, to observe the working-regulations of his employer and his union, and to produce a fair day's labour, he may regret that he was not taught that obedience to a just authority is part of the normal business of living.

Detterents

Risinghill was, therefore, a non-authoritarian school in the literal sense, and it followed that Duane would brook no censure of the children, no matter what form their "self-expression" took. There was always, for him, a reason for their disobedience and their destructiveness, and it was never the simplest reason, that, like all human beings, they usually preferred to get their own way. Mrs. Berg would have us believe, for example, that it is possible for adolescent boys to set roller-towels on fire and to smash mirrors in a mere "fit of absent-mindedness". She does admit, however, as Duane did, that such activities are socially undesirable, as is the habit of writing obscenities on corridor walls, and destroying books and equipment. Obviously these children had to be "persuaded" to adopt a more constructive attitude towards their immediate society. Here the argument against corporal punishment becomes protracted and somewhat tedious. Parents and teachers are divided on this question, but it would seem fair to assume that the great majority take the view that, used with restraint as a last resort, it is a detterent not to be despised. The author

rejects this utterly, as did Michael Duane, seeing the use of the cane as part of "the middle-class sado-masochistic pattern" of the "so-called good schools", symptomatic of the inherent brutality of the capitalist structure. "Mr. Duane," she says, "thought not so much about teachers' rights," though it is doubtful whether he shared her frequently expressed opinion that 99 per cent of British teachers are neurotic would-be sadists, who consider all children as evil. The teachers, according to this book, are natural enemies of the young, and Mrs. Berg challenges us with the extraordinary question, "What does one learn from enemies but enmity?"

Mature Judgment not to be expected from the Young

From Duane comes a rather more serious challenge. Clearly, he holds contemporary society to be the real culprit. He asks "whether our cultural standards set before the young, whether the example of our leading politicians and entertainers, so assiduously thrust before their eyes, are worthy of emulation; whether the accepted practices of business and industry conform to any reasonable definition of 'civilised' or 'democratic' or whether, in fact, the common reactions of violence and aggression by the young towards our pretensions that we have 'God on our side' may not be the healthy, if crude, protest of those who crave for integrity in action as well as talk". It would be difficult to find anyone who is prepared to say that there is no corruption in our society, but this is very far from asserting that society itself is corrupt, as Duane seems to imply. Neither has he offered any evidence that today's young are more rebellious than their fathers were. That they are more violent, and less self-disciplined is fairly obvious. The question is simply how this age-old problem can be solved in contemporary terms. Michael Duane's answer was to set the children "free" of all authoritarianism, and in this he chose to ignore two vital factors. First, though a school is truly a miniature society, it is a society of young people who should not be expected to exercise mature judgment. To expect them to do so, especially when the children in question

are, according to this author, emotionally deprived and of generally low mental ability, is simply to place an unnecessary burden on their young shoulders. Secondly, society as a whole has a right to expect from its schools an adequate supply of skills, manual and intellectual. There is no quicker method (short of war) of destroying a nation's prosperity than to waste the potential of what Ernest Bevin once called one of the greatest assets this nation ever had, the latent skills of the younger generation. Undisciplined, dissipated talent is not only a personal tragedy, but also potentially dangerous.

Teachers who search this book for signs of Duane's classroom craft will be disappointed. The accounts of Risinghill's achievements in the classroom, on the games field, on the school stage, are simply a repetition of the achievements of any similar school in any part of the country. The author presents them as unique; to the initiated they are disappointingly ordinary. Unless Mrs. Berg, understandably, simply failed to recognise a particular teaching craft in process, one is left with the suspicion that Duane, in fact, gave these children nothing new, and yet took from them something vital to their future welfare; that is, the sense of respect for human society, however imperfect a particular society may be at a given moment. Obsessed by his rage against those who abuse authority, he seems to have fallen into the obvious trap of transferring his rage against authority itself; clearly, he does not accept the Chowther Report's assertion, "Primacy must be given to the human rights of the individual boy or girl. But we do not believe that the pursuit of national efficiency can be ranked much lower, not least because without it the human rights themselves will not be secure".

Once we are aware that poverty, or the threat of poverty, should be cast out of our system we have experienced a change of heart. Then we can proceed to reform in such matters as worker participation in control of enterprise, the establishment of a rational and humane code of labour relations, and the easing of the terrible burdens laid on the widow, the sick, the unemployed, and the old . . . Revolution usually replaces one gang of crooks by another.

Reform or Revolution

J. M. JACKSON

ONE of the most remarkable changes that have come over the Catholic scene in recent years has been in the attitude of many Catholics towards communism. There is much to be said for recognising that communism (or perhaps it would be more accurate to say state socialism) has established itself in a large part of the world, and the Church must learn to live with this situation. There is nothing incompatible in seeking a *modus vivendi* with the state in eastern Europe and regarding communism as a system that is inherently undesirable. It is an undesirable system in two respects: first, it is an officially atheistic regime, and as such has denied religious freedom to its citizens; and secondly, the economic and political organisation of communist states has denied other essential rights to citizens.

One need not suppose that Communist regimes today are the same as they were in the Stalinist era. Changes have taken place. In some cases, the liberalising movement has not gone very far as some of the recent Russian trials have shown, whilst the movement in Czechoslovakia appears to have been proceeding rather too rapidly for the liking of the Russian authorities. If, however, these regimes allow freedom of religious observance and freedom from such evils

as arbitrary arrest; if their communism becomes primarily a matter of the state ownership and control of the means of production, there is no reason why the Church should not be prepared to concede a measure of toleration. They would remain far from ideal states. No regime can be regarded as ideal which does not permit, for example, reasonably full freedom for individuals to express their views on important issues, to have their children educated in the way they prefer, and so on.

This is not to say that societies which recognise such freedoms may not deny other equally important freedoms. Our own society has achieved a great deal in the course of its evolution. The citizen enjoys freedom of speech and, despite both inherent defects in the law and the inevitable errors of its administration by fallible human beings, freedom from arbitrary arrest and punishment without due process of law. On the other hand, it is undeniable that in the past no thought was given to the fact that millions were denied the right to an adequate share of the country's wealth; or even if they had a reasonable sufficiency they did not enjoy the assurance that they would continue to enjoy such a sufficiency in the future. For the majority, unemployment or sickness or retirement could mean abject poverty. Even today, we are a long way from abolishing either poverty or the threat of poverty, but it would be unfair to suggest that we have not become increasingly aware of the responsibilities of society in this direction.

The Catholic Marxists

What is much more surprising than the fact that the Church in eastern countries should seek a *modus vivendi* with communism is that there should be Catholics who have gone a very long way towards accepting the tenets of Marxism. They appear to identify the Christian gospel with revolutionary Marxism. There is still a great deal that is wrong with the society in which we live. The important question is whether it is possible to bring about a gradual reform of that system or whether an acceptable society can be brought about by revolution.

It is, of course, one thing to argue that Christianity should be a revolutionary force in the world. If everybody were to be truly imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, the world would be a very different place, *even with the existing structure of society and its institutions*. We would, no doubt, also see the rapid transformation of these institutions where this is necessary for the achievement of a better society. It is quite unnecessary, quite illogical to suppose that the only kind of revolution is either violent or Marxist.

It is equally wrong to suppose that by refusing to subscribe to these revolutionary ideas the Church has betrayed the spirit of the Gospel. If the Catholic Marxist of today thinks that the official teaching of the Church on social issues has been inadequate, that bishops and popes have betrayed the revolutionary message of Christianity, they should reflect that this betrayal goes back a very long way in history—very nearly two thousand years, in fact, for was it not Peter himself who advised servants to be submissive even to inconsiderate masters rather than encourage them to overthrow the established social order? *

The Negativism of Revolution

The Church has always recognised that there may be conditions in which the use of force to overthrow a tyrannical regime is justified. It is, however, a right which exists only in the most exceptional circumstances. This is very wise. Whilst it may be very obvious that one regime is bad, it by no means follows that the alternative which a revolution will produce is going to be any better. It may well be that there was a great deal wrong with the Czarist regime in Russia; possibly even to the point where one might feel that revolt was justified in terms of the traditional teaching of the Church. But can it be suggested that the Communist regime which emerged in its place was all that much better? Was the new regime, with an economy based on the ruthless exploitation of the peasant and relying to a large extent on

* 1 Peter ch. 2, vv. 18-20.

forced labour, really less oppressive than that of the Czars ? *

The real danger of revolution is that it is, on the whole, negative. The evils of an existing regime are obvious enough, and so may be the need to overthrow it, but it is far from easy to know just what is going to be put in its place. Those concerned with bringing down a regime are not in a position to know precisely what kind of institutions they are going to put in place of those which are swept away; nor have they much time to think about what is to happen when the revolution has gained its objective.

The Importance of Institutions

The institutional framework of a society is of vital importance to it. The type of governmental and business organisation provides a framework within which decisions are taken. Who, in the last resort, decides what is to be done ? What kind of considerations influence his decisions ? What is his motivation and objective ? If an existing institutional framework is destroyed, there is necessarily great difficulty in building a new framework in its place. The immediate consequence of revolution can easily be chaos, and this is conducive to the rise of a new despotism.

It is significant that the New Left Catholics in Britain today write at great length and incomprehensibility of the evils of the capitalist system which they want to destroy but they say remarkably little about the kind of society they would like to see in its place. It is no use talking glibly about Christian commitment. Apart from the fact that there are still a good many people who believe that a wholehearted commitment to Christianity and the service of their fellow men does not require the acceptance of the gospel according to Marx, they refuse to face up to the need to try and show in positive terms the kind of society they want to create. In the economic field, for example, we should be told how

* Much of the forced labour was the result of sheer economic necessity. Forced labour was not so much a punishment inflicted on those who were really opponents of Communism as a means of securing labour for unpleasant jobs without having to offer inflationary wage increases to attract workers. Many of those sent to forced labour were, in fact, loyal party members arrested on trumped up charges.

business enterprises are to be organised, what kind of management structure there is to be, what principles are to govern the decision making of the firm with regard to such matters as what and how much to produce, how many workers of different kinds to employ, what wages to pay them, and so on. Are enterprises to produce for a market? If not, how are the decisions of individual enterprises to be co-ordinated and made to fit into the needs of the economy as a whole? There are signs that they are favourably inclined to the idea of workers' control of the enterprise, but this has its difficulties as well as attractions. In itself, the idea of workers' control is quite compatible with traditional Catholic social teaching. This has always advanced the proposition that workers ought to be much more closely associated with the control of the enterprises in which they work. Several encyclicals have suggested that the workers might become shareholders also, but there is a great deal to be said in favour of the view that they should, in fact, participate in control *qua* workers. There is, of course, no reason why worker-controlled enterprises should not be created alongside the more common type of enterprise in our own society. Indeed, a few such enterprises do exist.*

The Danger of Economic Chaos

There is a grave danger that revolutionaries will simply fail to face up to the facts of economic life. Modern capitalism may have done much to de-personalise a man's work, but it has also brought a high material standard of living. That achievement must not be forgotten. Material standards are not everything, but neither are they unimportant. There is still a great deal of poverty in this country today, and we should be trying by every means in our power to remedy that poverty. It is no remedy for poverty to reduce the efficiency of our economic machine. Many people are badly housed: the only remedy for bad housing is to increase the output of the construction industry.

* While it would certainly be desirable to encourage the growth of both worker participation in control and of fully worker-controlled enterprises in appropriate cases, there is no good reason why a man who has refrained from spending part of his income should be denied the right, perhaps in combination with others, to use his (or their) savings to start a productive enterprise.

The capacity of the economy is limited. A revolutionary change might increase or decrease that capacity in greater or lesser degree. It would not be basically changed, and there would inevitably be the danger of disillusionment which would follow the realisation of this obvious fact. There is also the danger that a totalitarian regime which emerges as the result of revolution will set its own economic targets which involve a depression of the standard of living.

The standard of living in Russia fell disastrously after the Revolution for two reasons. First, because it failed to secure the cooperation of the peasants and agricultural output fell. Secondly, because the regime placed undue emphasis on long-term development and, as a result, devoted an undue proportion of the national product to investment and too little to the production of consumption goods. Exports of wheat, for example, were increased despite falling production in order to pay for the import of capital goods needed to increase the spread of industrialisation.

The Path of Reform

One may argue, of course, that the evils which followed past revolutions need not follow any future revolution, whether violent or otherwise. That this might prove to be so is not impossible. Nevertheless, it would really be very rash to believe that what has been would not be again. Can we believe that much good came of either the French Revolution or the Russian Revolution, or our own Civil War? * And why should any future revolutionary movement do any better?

Reform may seem to imply two things: first, a gradualness in approach, and secondly an acceptance of many or even most of the essential characteristics of our present society. There is a great deal to be said for proceeding with a measure of caution. Ideas that look well on paper may not work, so it is a good idea to try things out before putting

* It may be added that what might be termed a "palace revolution", such as that of 1688 in Britain is of a very different kind from the revolutions under consideration in this article. A coup which merely changes the ruler(s) but leaves the main institutions of a society unchanged is very different in character from a movement that aims at a fundamental change in the fabric of society.

them into general operation, and to try one or two ideas at a time.

The reformist approach may imply an acceptance of much of the framework of present day society *in the short run*. Nevertheless, it is quite possible for gradual reform to bring about, over time, a total change in society which is really fundamental. The British Welfare State has not achieved all its creators hoped it would; it is arguable that in many respects it has gone about things in the wrong way: yet it has its achievements; and it would be quite false to suggest that this and other reforms have not created today a society that is very different from that of 1914 or even 1939.

There are a good many directions in which reform might go. In business enterprises, the most obviously required changes are a measure of worker participation in control, the establishment of a code of labour relations to cover such matters as procedures for dealing with redundancy, disciplinary measures and so on, and for establishing some kind of norms for prices and profits. In our social security system there are still serious gaps. Apart from the fact that we do not yet provide an adequate income for all workers who are unable to work through sickness or unemployment or old age, there are some groups for whom little or nothing is done (including some widows and disabled housewives). Low wages in some industries are still a grave problem and mean very real poverty for a man with several children. This is a problem for which there is no single answer. A national minimum wage might help, though even this may need to be reinforced by increased family allowances. There is a great deal of change that is desirable, A great deal of change is possible within the framework of society. Whether that change will come about quickly is a matter of willing the end. The real revolution is not to be in the outward forms of society but in the hearts of men. Given *that* revolution, all else would follow: we would then see the present forms of social organisation used and not abused where they were basically good and modified where they were not.

Should there be compulsory religious instruction in State schools? What should be done about student discontent throughout the world? Are all heresies in the Church concerned with faith, or could they be about morals? Is it not against the common good to keep imbeciles alive?

Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Should there be compulsory religious teaching in State schools ?

I wonder where your question comes from—it is altogether too easy. The answer is that the worship of God must be free to be genuine; and compulsion is therefore foreign to religion, whether in teaching it or in ensuring that it is practised. Religious observance which is secured by external authority is itself external, and not the personal union with God which it ought to be.

From that premise, one could easily slip into support of the campaign at present being conducted by a group of determined humanists for the abandonment of the existing legal requirement that religion be taught in State schools; and by supporting them one would desert the majority of parents, who wish religious instruction to be continued.

The word "compulsory" is an interloper in a question concerning religious education in State schools. The correct word would be "statutory". Should the State make provision for the teaching of religion? Certainly it should, if it possibly can. Man's primary relationship is with God, and to be himself he must know it and its implications. Those States which ban religion from schools are depriving their members of vital self-knowledge and are harming themselves by producing falsely oriented citizens. In this country, as opinion polls show, most parents want their children to have religious instruction in school; and it would be gravely wrong

of any government not to accede to their wishes. The minority can be left to opt out of religious instruction if they want.

Do I need to elaborate the truth that the duty of worshipping God is perfectly consistent with the essential freedom of true worship?

What should be done about student discontent throughout the world?

Be patient in trying to understand it. What are its causes? Why is it expressed in vast gatherings? What proportion of demonstrating students use violence, and for what reasons?

A young man or woman who is not looking forward to the future and planning for it is a sad creature. The future belongs to the young, and they should face it responsibly. Many will think only of their own family and livelihood; but all should be aware of the national and international setting of their personal life, and should shape it as best they can for their own and the common good. An older generation which has lived through decades of warfare can be excused for relaxing in a period of comparative peace. Their juniors cannot afford to relax, but must be alert to defects in the present lest the future be ruined.

Those of student age today are in some ways better off, and in some ways worse off, than their forbears. In this country they have been brought up to the notion that they can have what they want, including their own way, for the asking. Authority questions itself and should not be surprised when it is questioned by those subject to it. The provision by the State of free everything has sapped self-reliance in a rising generation better informed, more numerous and more in the limelight than any preceding generation. They have knowledge and power without the restraint and moderation which come from dependence on self.

The remedy is to give them freedom (including a freedom to provide for themselves in cooperation with their elders).

The young should be invited to share in any planning which concerns them. The mass of them — between the admirable idealists of boundless generosity in the service of others and the instigators of violent attacks on freedom — are not sufficiently concerned. But in order to make a healthy future they will have to rescue the principles that are now being submerged in a swamp of permissiveness.

**Are all heresies in the Church concerned with faith,
or could they be about morals ?**

Heresy is a false doctrine. Doctrine is what is taught. The Church teaches both "faith and morals", and about both there can be false doctrine, i.e. heresy.

Errors about faith are more likely to be noticed than those about morals, because the articles of the creed and of the many "confessions" of faith are more obviously concerned with revelation and have had to be most carefully formulated, so that a departure from them stands out as erroneous. In the early centuries of the Church, false doctrines about Christ, the Blessed Trinity, and grace had to be corrected, with a consequent building up of the Christian tradition by the ordinary and extraordinary *magisterium* and the belief of all the faithful.

Doctrine about behaviour, though some of it is revealed, can always be related to the natural law, as it must suit human nature; and therefore it seems to "stand to reason". When Christianity is generally accepted, as in Europe until, say, the French Revolution, the main principles of the Christian way of life, in conformity, as they are, with the natural law, are not denied, and there are no "moral" heresies. They have been appearing for a long time now, as society becomes less and less religious. The root error is the claim that man is his own law — the error against which Adam and Eve were warned when they were forbidden to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The modern heresies derive from that one — that there is no natural law, there are no absolute standards of morality, and whatever behaviour suits you in your situation is good morals for you. Even Catholics

can be found who say that indissoluble marriage is right for them, but divorce is right for others.

Is it not against the common good to keep imbeciles alive ?

The answer depends, doesn't it, on what is meant by "common good" and that meaning is arrived at by answering two questions: "Good for whom?" and, after the answer, "Good for man", the second question: "What is man?"

Laws or decrees for the extermination of imbeciles have been made within living memory, on the ground that imbeciles contribute nothing to the national economy and are a drain on national resources. The aged, similarly, have been slowly starved to death because they also are economically not worth their keep; and a whole class of people—peasant proprietors — has been destroyed as an obstacle to a particular ideological economy. If a high material standard of living is the common good, then for the sake of the common good you can get rid of those who lower the standard of living; and, as you get rid of imbeciles, you can soothe your conscience by telling it that imbeciles are no good even to themselves.

In the process of doing away with them, you make nonsense of the first assertion in various Declarations of the Rights of Man that man has a right to life. For the principle that any innocent person must be allowed, and assisted, to live to his natural term, you substitute the rule of thumb that the right to go on living can be withdrawn — by whom? For the moment, by the Minister of Economic Affairs; but there are other experts jostling for a place on that tribunal of life and death. Once you deny the sacredness of human life, you make everybody's tenure of life insecure.

Blackstone, in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, says that the basic law underlying all good laws is the law of nature — what we call the natural law. By that law, all life is God's, and we must answer for it to Him.

Is it not unfair that wicked human beings should share the fate of the incomparably more intelligent angels?

If it is God's judgment that human beings and angels share the same fate for wickedness, then the judgment is just. Our job then would be to try and understand the justice of the decree, brightening our ideas of justice with the help of prayer.

It is, however, a mistake to consider "fate" as a general condition into which every person is received, or plunged, without regard to the essential uniqueness of personality. In heaven, every member of God's family is unmistakably himself or herself, manifesting, for all to see, God's grace accepted and used in a particular, individual history. In those whose lives are an ultimate failure there will be a kind of negative individuality, shown not in perfections but in corruptions of personal being.

There is a common fate in that angels and human beings are persons, empowered in their nature to decide their eternal future by choosing to be present to God or to be absent from him. That is fair enough, as both have the essential freedom of personality. But, just as there are degrees of presence to God, made by personal stature (Our Lady, as the greatest human person, is most present to God), so there are degrees of absence, depending on the magnitude of the person that has been irrevocably crippled. As the proverb says: *Corruptio optimi pessima* — the worst kind of corruption is that of the best. It is true that permanent absence from God is an absolute, and it seems meaningless to postulate degrees of an absolute; but there is some meaning, isn't there, in a comparison between two thirsts, both insatiable, but the one immeasurably more intense and searing than the other?

Is it right or wrong to punish conscientious objectors?

The objection you have in mind is, I suppose, to service in the armed forces, during the war or in time of peace.

emotionally I am inclined to wish that I could say at once that those with a conscientious objection to warfare should never be punished for refusing to serve; but the problem does not admit so easy a solution.

Basically the problem is that of a collision between two consciences, those of authority and of subjects, and it can happen anywhere — in the Church, or in a religious order, or in the State. The subject is not the only one with a conscience: the superior has one too. When they are opposed to one another and all hope of reconciliation has vanished, each must act on his conscience, the superior by insisting on obedience, and, also for the sake of order, the subject should submit to punishment.

The rights and wrongs of international warfare — wars of aggression and defence, nuclear weapons, deterrents and revolutionary ideologies — are obscure. An honourable man, like the Austrian peasant who was executed for refusing to join the Nazi army, will not support plain aggression; and such authority, which is in bad conscience, will destroy him. But a government engaged honestly in self-defence will have the support of a majority and can rightly expect from minorities at least submission to the punishment inflicted as a sign of the majority's disapproval.

The punishment has to be severe enough to make plain the general duty of obedience to a lawful and conscientious authority; but it must not be contemptuous or vindictive.

Book Review

IN THEIR ALLEY

Bury Me in My Boots by Sally Trench; Hodder & Stoughton, 25s; pp. 191.

I BEGAN to realise that my coffee trips were futile — they only brought temporary relief, whereas these people needed something more permanent with more individual care and attention. But the needs of these outcasts were insufficiently met or even understood by the public. To give them practical help needed money, time and professional skills. Of which I had none. My own inadequacy to assist them haunted me, so I went in search of others who felt the same. I found people kind and sympathetic, but not prepared to stick their necks out and become involved. What was so frustrating, most of the objections they offered were reasonable. After all, the down-and-out was an unattractive figure. He was pitiful and, at the same time, inspired a sense of disgust and exasperation in any self-respecting person, that he could drift so far from any contact with responsibility. Was an unhappy childhood, a broken home, war neurosis, or any other commonly cited cause, enough to bring a man to that point of degradation? Who were we to judge? Whatever the cause, I felt it was society's responsibility to help break their pattern since they did rely on us as their fellow-men. Thus I was determined to reinstate the rejected from their no-man's land, not on a temporary basis but permanently. How I was intending to do this I had no idea, and after a short space of time I realised that it would not be with the support of my family or friends who so strongly disapproved."

The writer is talking of the tramps, drug addicts and meths drinkers who at night haunt the great hall of Waterloo Station, the old bomb-sites of central London and the condemned shells of houses of the East End, and in the day, loiter round the fountains of Trafalgar Square, sprawl on the

benches in the National Gallery or wander down the paths of Hyde Park, conning the passer-by for the odd shilling to buy "a cup of tea". Every Londoner must have seen them and hurriedly tried to pass them by. Nor are their numbers confined to the Metropolis. They can be found in any large city and in most countries of the western world. Tramps and hobos there have always been; drunkards also, profligate and unable to hold down a job for a regular wage; but the advent of high taxation on potable spirits has led to the unethical drinking of meths and surgical spirits; the advent of the narcotics peddler coupled with a growing section ofudderless youth has brought in the age of the hippy and the drug addict. So often the meths drinker is one who has started by trying to conform to the needs and demands of society, has failed and has finally drifted outside its confines. The hippy has probably never even tried and has opted out as soon as he could forcibly break out. Spasmodic attempts are made by social workers and government medical institutions to find a cure for both drinkers and addicts in hospitals or through clinical treatment. Doctors and psychiatrists produce figures and facts to try and arouse the "social conscience" to an awareness of the appalling dangers to youth. But to the vast majority of us, both drinkers and addicts are but a passing concern who merit little serious thought or attention because they both seem to be beyond the pale, and, if they are not willing to help themselves — as so often seems the case — how can they be helped by others? But to one person at least, both groups of outcasts have merited not only thought and attention, but further active Christian participation. Miss Sally Trench in her *Bury Me in My Boots* does not describe what others should do for these particular outcasts, nor least of all what government should do, but what she herself has actively and persistently done.

It might be thought that the quotation with which this review opened, had been written by a person of mature middle age who had followed courses in sociology and, from behind a comfortable desk, interviewed scores of "cases". Instead they are the simple convictions of a girl, formed

about the age of eighteen and who is today no more than twenty-three. She had had no training in any social science except the rather "unscientific" one of a childhood love of the old-style tramp. But a big heart need have done no more than lead her to dole out adult half-crowns in place of the childhood pennies and cakes. Courage and determination were also essential for what she began and carried on doing; and also, and this above all — as she herself clearly states — her trust in God and her gradual though painful realisation, that she was doing His work as His human instrument, and therefore that self-esteem at success as well as depression at apparent failure, should play no part in her activity. We cannot but be reminded of St. Vincent de Paul working in the appalling slums of Paris, of St. Camillus de Lellis or St. Ignatius working in fever-ridden and overcrowded hospitals of Rome, but these were mature men, giants in their period, and here we have a young girl, but recently expelled from her convent for indiscipline, cycling across London in the dead of night, her haversack loaded with flasks of coffee and sandwiches and feeding the derelicts on the platform of Waterloo station and the derries of Stepney. Slowly she had to win their confidence, to convince them that she was one with them, though not of them, that she was not just a kindly dispenser of material goods, but one who understood and sympathised and would take infinite pains to assist them where they most needed help. Assuredly she went in at their door, but with the abiding determination that some, at least, should come out at hers.

Sally Trench never seems to have lowered her standards or her sights, nor in her book does she conceal her failures and disappointments, even when they hurt most. She could be beaten up, battered and left half-dead in return for weeks of patient and exhausting care. She could sit on the rotten floor of a derelict house, holding the hand and comforting the brow of a decrepit and dying meths drinker. She admits she made mistakes in her methods of approach — which of us would dare try even a bungling approach?—yet obviously she learned quickly, and remarkably so for a girl of her years: "Quite suddenly it came to me that the simple

failure of people to make contact with one another was often the cause of such human problems. What a paradox ! We can bounce messages off the moon and send space probes to Mars, yet we are finding it more difficult as each day passes to communicate with the minds and hearts of those we love. Love is the climate in which all living things flourish. This language of love is designed to crack the shell of isolation by effective channels of communication. It is a universal language which is sadly neglected. Love is like gratitude, not much good unless you can show it. No doubt these addicts had relations who normally loved them, but for these lone wolves it must be a tender understanding and a personal care, not just verbal concern. They needed compassion, not condemnation."

Sally entered the full service of the drinkers and addicts of her own volition and slowly and painfully learned by her mistakes but, having no wish just to boost her own ego, she gladly learned from her elders in the same or a similar field and went willingly to them for advice. From Anton Wallich Clifford, founder of the Simon Community for the down-and-outs and with whom she worked for more than a year, from the Rev. Peke of the Golborne Centre, she obtained counsel and encouragement; and from a little dinner party with Lady Henriques, perhaps the sanest help of which at the time she was so much in need. "You see," Lady Henriques said, "the burdens and responsibilities and emotional strains are so vast that they cannot be put onto one pair of shoulders. You must . . . find people with your drive and dedication to help you in this work. . . ." (How wise she was; how foolish I had been—Sally's comment) . . . "Remember, child, don't rush God. In His own time, He will let you have the money you require and not before. Work hard, save as much as you can. . . . God is with you, and well ahead of you too !"

Sally Trench never reached that third stage, as Lady Henriques called it, in the development of her work; the recruitment of like-minded dedicated workers. She was blazing a trail which few could follow. Compelled to rest through illness, she reviewed the past and planned out the

future: "I wondered how long I could remain morally and mentally unharmed if I stayed on the road. . . . What future had I continuing work at that level? Eventually I would weaken and be dragged down. One can stand alone for so long but the break would come! I kept telling myself that God had made a community, to live as a community, to be community builders, not to be alone. I suddenly realised that I had yet to learn to work compatibly with other people, and that as long as I failed to communicate or blend in with ordinary normal people, I would never mature. . . . I ditched my dosser clothes and went home".

It would be too much to ask the meths drinkers to read this volume, but the beatniks and would-be beatniks would find it easy and most instructive. The romance is taken right out of their existence and as Sally herself reminds one of the young addicts, all of whom despise the grime and dirt and all-over filthiness of the older hoboes and drinkers, the beatniks are already set on the road to becoming one of them. The professional social worker may experience a certain disdain at the amateur fumbblings of a young girl without a two-year course and a diploma behind her. And the general reader, apart from being fascinated by a story which is alive from beginning to end, may well ask himself the question, not, "What is the Government doing about this?" but rather "what am I personally going to do about this? What will be my attitude to the aimless young in the future? How can I do something to prevent one more child from following the path that leads to a feckless existence?" Our way will not be Sally's way, nor, as her closing pages make clear, would she herself advise it. But at least we could not reach the final page without our mental and moral outlook in some way being the better for her story and analysis.

C. M. Keane, S.J.